

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Concord, NH
District of Merrimack NH
Docket # . **1:21-cv-00748-SM**
Favorite Things
a DBA
Natasha Athens
v.
Bank of America et al
Megan Scholz
Defendants

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF INTERLOCATORY APPEAL OF JUDGE
McAuliffe's Order Partial Dismissal and Order for Illicit Taxes and Judicial
complicity in bank fraud 18 U.S. Code § 1344 - Bank fraud

Now comes the Plaintiff in the above entitled law suit and does file an
notice of appeal on this case.

Judge McAuliffe has illegal ties to both the Defendant and their attorney
and failed to issue a default ruling, despite the Plaintiff never being served,
and he furthered his illegal ties and dragged out a case for months on a
CARES act Bank Loan, to which he can not alter or nullify it's forgiveness.

Only a DOJ proving a fraudulent loan can seek recovery of the lawfully
obtained, and correctly spent funds, that were given either in error or by
fraud and that never happened.

Judge McAuliffe threatened the lawful forgiveness of the Plaintiff's loan by
trying to extort illegal documents and an affidavit, from HER, but not from
the people committing the crimes of bank fraud.

In the attached pleading, it's BLATANTLY clear that the judge has too
much compromise to do his job and use the Constitution.

Judge Johnstone and Judge McAuliffe failed to recuse themselves despite
blatant ties and bias, and they continued after default and failure to even
serve Notice of Appearance of their Attorney, Thomas Pappas.

There are no exceptions the the 2 part system of both filing and service, for
the exact reason that filings and even lottery winnings get posed in "spam"
folders, either by accident or on purpose.

<https://nypost.com/2022/01/24/woman-stumbled-on-winning-lottery-ticket-in-spam-email-folder/>

Court pleadings can be placed there w/ the intention of defaulting a party or any other reason, thus 25 years ago, they approved 2 party filing and service, just like filing and serving by 1st class mail, or a sheriff.

The judge was so bias and connected that he failed to issue a default ruling, ever seek the Defendant to answer to why she pulled a loan out of forgiveness, stole bank tax records, closed a business account, and did this, and how many people she did this to.

Despite the court KNOWING that there are gatekeepers tracking the borrowed money, vs, the money in forgiveness, and multiple investigators overseeing the funds, this judge tried to become a "bank robber" with both Thomas Pappas, and Megan Scholz, and try to set up the Plaintiff in a way no Plaintiff can ever be ordered to answer to.

(see Exhibit one) The Judge's Order - it's not a legal order, and it FAILED to allow for compensation to the Plaintiff who was lawfully allowed a second loan under the program and BOA was cheating even on the 2nd round to steal the funds for themselves and not let businesses obtain them.

In an UNLAWFUL dismissal for compensation, Judge McAuliffe cannot legally deny damages when there was actual injury, and going on 2 years of anguish, stress, high blood pressure, typing court paperwork on a 100% forgivable loan.

WHEREFORE The Plaintiff, who wrote all of the above, plus the Default of Thomas Pappas, show that this judge is into nefarious activities with the Defendant and that attorney, and refused to rule for the right of forgiveness his only duty under the law.

No one has legal authority to touch a loan, or alter it's numbers once received. This is something Bank of America has done to the SMALLEST of businesses, in order to create new business in either stealing their forgivable funds, or forcing them into bankruptcy. At which point, they make a new set of income, with Thomas Pappas doing their cases.

The parties were offered a dozen offers to settle this matter, and redo the loan, and failed, never responded and tried to set up very compromised judges to do their dirty laundry, and mop up their mess and they both obliged and cannot.

The Plaintiff seeks a default ruling on Thomas Pappas, and an appeal on the entire case for the \$5Million she sought, and an order to issue a new Forgiveness application in the amount of the loan, \$18625.00 in which the 1st Circuit Court must do under Bank Fraud law

18 U.S. Code § 1344 - Bank fraud

The Plaintiff is indigent, and filing a motion to waive the fee, see attached.

/s/ Natasha Athens

FILED with the court on January 24, 2022

The other side never served his notice of appearance, defaulting him under the rules for electronic filing. He has also defaulted on the other parts of this case on appeal, thus this appeal is moot, and the Plaintiff just needs a ruling.

Once any part of the case is lost, so is the rest of the case.